

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-22, 25, and 26 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 11 and 21. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 3, 4, 13, 14, 23 and 24. New claims added herein are none.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] Examiner Dada graciously spoke with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on July 23, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates his willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, we discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely Wood. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, we also discussed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to distinguish over the cited art of record. For example, the Examiner indicated that clarification regarding measurement of strength of the authentication mechanism would appear to distinguish claim 1 over the cited art, namely Wood. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0007] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0008] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0009] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0010] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 11 and 21 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features in accordance with our telephone discussion with the examiner. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to cited prior art.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112

[0011] Claims 21, 22, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0012] Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-22, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0013] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-22, 25, and 26 under §102. For at least the reasons discussed during the above mentioned Examiner's Interview and the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not shown that cited references anticipate the rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0014] The Examiner's rejections are based upon: **Wood: Wood, et al.**, US Patent No. 6,609,198 (issued Aug. 19, 2003).

Overview of the Application

[0015] The Application describes a technology for improved methods and arrangements for controlling access to resources in a computing environment. The methods and arrangements specifically identify the authentication mechanism/mechanisms, and/or characteristics thereof, used in verifying a user, to subsequently operating security mechanisms. Thus, differentiating user requests based on this additional information provides additional control.

[0016] By way of example, the above-stated needs and others are met by a method for use in a computer capable of supporting multiple authentication mechanisms. The method includes generating an operating system representation (e.g., a security token, etc) of at least one identity indicator, for example, a user or account identity, associated with and identifying at least one authentication mechanism, and subsequently controlling access to at least one resource based on the operating system representation. In certain implementations, the method further includes generating at least one security identifier (SID) that identifies the authentication mechanism in some way, for example, by name or

number and/or perhaps by measure of strength such as the type/length of an encryption process/key employed by the authentication mechanism. In other implementations, for example, the method includes comparing the operating system representation to at least one access control list having at least one access control entry therein. Here, for example, the access control entry may operatively specify whether the user authenticated by the authentication mechanism is permitted to access the resource.

Cited Reference

Wood

[0017] Wood describes a technology for a single sign-on for multiple information resources. Rather than specifying a single authentication scheme for all information resources, the security architecture associates trust-level requirements with information resources. Authentication schemes (e.g., those based on passwords, certificates, biometric techniques, smart cards, etc.) are employed depending on the trust-level requirement(s) of an information resource (or information resources) to be accessed. Once credentials have been obtained for an entity and the entity has been authenticated to a given trust level, access is granted, without the need for further credentials and authentication, to information resources for which the authenticated trust level is sufficient. The security architecture allows upgrade of credentials for a given session. This capability is particularly advantageous in the context of a single, enterprise-wide log-on. An entity (e.g., a user or an application) may initially log-on with a credential suitable for one or more resources in an initial resource set, but then require access to resource requiring authentication at higher trust level. In such case, the log-on service allows additional credentials to be provided to authenticate at the higher trust level. The log-on service

allows upgrading and/or downgrading without loss of session continuity (i.e., without loss of identity mappings, authorizations, permissions, and environmental variables, etc.).

Anticipation Rejections

[0018] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.¹ Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.²

Based upon Wood

[0019] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-22, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 21

[0020] Applicant submits that Wood does not anticipate these claims because it does not show or disclose the following elements as recited in these claims (from claim 1, with emphasis added):

¹ "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

² See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

- generating at least one **indicator that identifies a user**, and is associated with and identifies at least one authentication mechanism that has been used to authenticate the user, wherein generating the indicator further includes identifying within the indicator at least one characteristic associated with the authentication mechanism, wherein **the at least one characteristic associated with the authentication mechanism includes a measure of strength of the authentication mechanism**, wherein the **measure of strength of the authentication mechanism depends on the length of key employed in an encryption process**.

[0021] In this Action, the Examiner equates the *trust level* disclosed by Smith with the “**measure of strength of the authentication mechanism**” recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0022] Unlike the “**measure of strength of the authentication mechanism**” of the claim, the *trust level* of Wood is not characterized as being dependent on the type of encryption process used and particularly the length of key employed. The *trust level* of Wood is an assigned value independent of any other assigned values. The assigned value of Wood’s *trust level* does not account for a measurement of strength of the authentication mechanism used to authenticate users as is claimed, but rather is directed to which assigned level of trust is necessary to access a given resource in context.

[0023] Consequently, Wood does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 21

[0024] Applicant further submits that Wood does not anticipate claim 6 21 because it does not show or disclose “an **access control list**.”

[0025] In this Action, it is unclear what the Examiner equates to the “**access control list**” recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

[0026] Unlike the “**access control list**” of the claim, Wood does not disclose an access control list (ACL). Instead, Wood describes a gatekeeper extracting login credentials from a request and passing the credentials to an authentication component which if authenticated queries an identification component to identify the requesting entity. Wood also merely describes a trust level as discussed above. However, Wood does not describe any access control list or comparing an indicator with the features claimed to any access control list.

Dependent Claim 6

[0027] This claim ultimately depends upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of the dependent claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0028] Applicant further submits that Wood does not anticipate claim 6 because it does not show or disclose “controlling access to the resource based on the indicator further includ[ing] comparing the indicator to at least one **access control list** having at least one access control entry therein.”

[0029] Consequently, Wood does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims

[0030] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0031] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**. Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 08/08/2007

By: 

Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas
Reg. No. 58213
(509) 324-9256 x259
bea@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com